WORDS OF RECONCILIATION.

VOL. IV.] AUGUST, 1888. [No. 8.

A PLEA FOR UNIVERSALISM.

Our readers will be surprised, upon reading the following letter, to know that there are Presbyterian ministers in charge of churches who go much beyond anything we have taught in the direction of universalism. Here is a pastor who writes to us from the West in friendly criticism because we do not go to the extent of teaching that all men will be saved. We publish all of his communication for which we have room and subjoin a reply.

DEAR BROTHER: Your kind letter is received with the desired book. I thank you heartily for your kind allowance regarding the Magazine. I will try to pay for it as I can. My dear brother, I desire to write you not as a critic, but as a loving brother and co-worker in the same cause. As such allow me first to express my hearty agreement with the main purpose of your book and magazine. I admire them both; but I beg leave also to express my contrary opinions on some points for which you will kindly forbear with me.

I. I agree fully with you that resurrection is of redemptive character. This I conclude with you from the fact that it is always spoken of in the Bible as due to Christ's mediatorship. Whereas sin bringeth death, Christ bringeth life to the dead. He affirms that He came not to destroy but to save men's lives. Christ *is* resurrection and life, and he that believeth on Him, though he were *dead*, yet shall he live. John xi. 25.

II. I agree with you that death brings to the sinner *immediate* trial and suffering, such as is described by Christ; not after, but *before* resurrection. Your book brought me much light on this point. It proves the point well.

III. I agree with you that the election of some is for the purpose of saving the rest. They are the firstborn, that are "*ordained* to go and bring forth fruit" John xv. 16. Election is a glorious doctrine in this light.

But now I beg leave to express my difference on the following points:

1st. I do not believe that a second death can defeat the glorious work of Christ.

It gives very little comfort to know that the first death can not ruin us, if a second death can. If the devil succeeds in robbing Christ of the fruit of His labor, He labored in vain, and the second death is either stronger than Christ or He did not intend to rescue from it. Why not then leave them who will fail the second time, to their first doom? Christ's victory over death and the devil must be complete, 1 Cor. xv. 55, 57. You evidently think it is better to give a half loaf than nothing, by saying Redemption is the fruit of Resurrection, but yet salvation is not universal. To throw the weight of the blame for this second failure on the creature, you have to introduce Arminianism (which you justly discard here) into the next world, by admitting that incorrigible sinners are the subjects of this death.

Who are *incorrigible* sinners? Salvation is by grace, and "where sin abounds grace does much more abound." "He shall divide the spoil with the *strong*." If Christ's redemption does not also include deliverance from the second death, why does not the Scripture give more prominence to this death? But the Scripture does not say that Christ abolished the *first* death, but simply designating the strongest enemy with the comprehensive term death, it says, "the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death."

I do not pretend to solve the difficulty, for I believe there are many points regarding the *mode* and *progress* of redemption

which we are not yet able to look into. But this does not hinder us from knowing the promised outcome. What lies between the promise and its final accomplishment is often very dark and even forbidden to know (Acts i. 7.), because God will exercise our faith and humility and cheerful obedience.

We know that the world by sin is lost; we also know "that the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world;" we, moreover, know that sinful man can not save himself, but that Christ came to seek and save that which is lost. The Good Shepherd will seek until he find.

John the Revelator, in chapter 20, is evidently not speaking of the final outcome but of the *progressive accomplishment* of the plan of redemption. But Paul was chosen to reveal the mystery (Eph. iii. 2–9) of the ages. He speaks plainly of the *outcome* in 1 Cor. xv. 22–28; Hebrews ii. 8; Phil. ii. 9–11; Eph. i. 20–23, and other places that could be cited.

God has a *time* for every *thing* and *purpose* under heaven. Eccles. ii. He will have all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth. God worketh in man to will and to do his good pleasure. Christ is able to save to the *uttermost* all that come unto God by him. "And they shall be *all* taught (drawn) of God." John vi. 44, 45. I believe these statements to be true to their full extent; yet I do not believe that any will ever be saved or see God without holiness. Only the pure in heart shall see God; but that is just the purpose for which Jesus came: To save us *from* sin. This, you will admit, is not "crude universalism."

When the world at first was finished, the verdict of God on *beholding* creation was: "*Very good.*" The verdict on Christ's work of new creation will include also *every thing made new*, Rev. xxi. 2, and men will say: "He hath done all things well," Mark 7, 37.

2d. I do not believe, as you seem to imply, that the suffering in hell or hades, to whatever degree or duration it may be inflicted, is properly a *curse*. It is punishment with correction in view. Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law in that He was made a curse for us," Gal. iii. 13. By virtue of this re-

demption Christ has brought all men into the *relation* to God of children. This is plain from Scripture, if we only distinguish between being actually God's children, and the being only *counted so.* "Until the time appointed by the Father there is no difference between a son and a servant." But God sent his Son to redeem them that were under the law and in bondage, that we might receive the adoption of sons. And because ye *are* sons, by virtue of that redemption, God hath sent forth his Spirit into your hearts, crying Abba, Father," Gal. iv. 1–7. So Christ redeemed us before the world was made, but *actually* only after 4,000 years. So when we receive by faith the Spirit of adoption, we are made *actually* God's faithful children. Look at another proof, from John xi. 52. "*The children of God*" that were scattered abroad, were no others than the Gentiles, that, by Paul, are called the children of wrath, even as others," Eph. ii. 3. Jesus teaches and *commandeth us*, Math. vi. 9, and xxviii. 20; even all nations, to pray to God as "Our Father." The Lord's Prayer is for *all* men. The universal fatherhood of God is already an Old Testament revelation, Mal. ii. 10; but the New makes it plain beyond doubt. "If the children of God forsake his law, He will visit their sins with the rod, and their iniquities with stripes, but his loving *kindness* he will not take away from him, nor suffer his faithfulness to fail," Ps. lxxxix. God has means to bring every prodigal home.

3d. I somewhat differ from you on the *nature* of death.

In my view death is a state of painful *existence.* It is a *separation* from blessed communion with God on account of sin. If that sin is forgiven and we are purged and healed from it, then perfect life is restored. Adam died the first day he sinned; though his body and soul yet lived. The prodigal son, when roaming from his father's house, was *dead*, and when again brought back, he was *alive.*

4th. It seems I differ from you regarding the nature and object of the Confession of Faith. I would not make an effort to amend or reconstruct the Confession, but rather displace it altogether as a binding rule of faith, *or interpretation.* You are right in complaining that the church has placed her *ruling*

Standards in the place of Christ. The Standards ought only to be *means* of knowing the mind of the church, and *aids* of interpretation like good commentaries. They have virtually no authority. A confession of faith can necessarily not be a *rule* of faith, because all men *can err*, as the Standards themselves admit. But an *uncertain* rule will not do. No one but an *infallible* Pope could make such a rule. Many divines can not make one without compromising. Will this make it true? I do not think so. When the church began to grow corrupt the *binding* confessions of faith began to be made. *Ruling* confessions are therefore a part of Popery. This is significant. We can not have a perfect confession of faith until we have a perfect *understanding*. But the Bible is the only perfect rule; let it suffice. Let the Standards serve as a means of *creating*, not *compelling* unity.

A Presbyterian Minister.

This letter is too long for us to attempt a detailed reply, but it falls in with one of the purposes of this magazine which is to afford the recalcitrant opinion in the Presbyterian church an opportunity to be heard, and to show the necessity for some change in its system. We are glad to know that there are many men in that church who are anxious to know the truth, and who seek it at first hands from the Word of God, even though their reaction from the rigors of that system drives them further toward restitutionism than we are prepared to go. This brother is evidently anxious to know and to follow the truth. We therefore ask him to consider in the way of reply:

1. That we agree as to the final outcome, that all things must be reconciled to God and that all God's enemies, the last of which is death, must be destroyed.

2. If we believed, as he appears to do, that man is inherently immortal, we would feel obliged to accept his con-

clusion that all souls will be finally restored. For it is both unscriptural and unphilosophical to conceive of a universe in which all things are reconciled unto God, with an eternal realm of rebellious souls hardened in sin and fixed in endless woe. But we believe that the weight of Scripture testimony is that man, as to both body and soul, is perishable. We freely admit that an immortal spirit of life from God lives in him. But the very question at stake in his moral training is whether this life of God shall build for itself an eternal habitation in him. He may become so degraded in character, he may so judge himself unworthy of eternal life, that this immortal spirit may not only cease to strive with him but to live in him. In that case his personality and individual being must vanish away. He fails of eternal life. Hence our Saviour teaches that men may so harden themselves against the grace of God as to have no forgiveness, neither in this world nor in the world to come. That resurrection will bring to multitudes the opportunity for such forgiveness this brother sees with us. But we cannot think it a heresy, even though it be called Arminianism, to believe that the same moral laws hold over in the world to come that prevail here, and that men there will be free to an extent which is not true of them here, to accept or reject salvation. The very purpose of an economy of redemption through resurrection is to repair the disadvantages of the fall. The argument therefore, that the same grace which has provided for recovery from the first death must also provide to save from the second, does not hold. For the circumstances under which the first death was incurred are not the same. By *one man* sin entered the world and death by sin, and so

death passed upon all men. But if any incur the second death, it will not be due to hereditary sin or evil environment, but to their own personal transgression.

3. The argument for universalism proceeds upon the assumption that God is in some way bound to save all His creatures. But the argument proves too much. It requires us to believe that not only the most degraded types of men, all infants born of lust or who perish in the womb, but even animals, these lower creatures of His hand to whom He has given life, must be lifted along the stages of progress until they are invested with eternal life and glory. If, in the progress of life toward that perfect image of Himself which glorified men shall wear forever at His right hand, multitudes of lower forms of life have perished in preparing his way, we cannot see why God may not suffer low and evil types of men to also perish. Some of these grade down very closely to the brute line, so that it is hard to see why He must be expected to lift the one to eternal life, and leave the other to become extinct. There are acknowledged difficulties, as our brother well observes, connected with this whole subject. Many Scripture passages, some of which he quotes, look strongly in the direction of universalism. But there are hard facts in nature and stern passages in Scripture which look strongly the other way. The Bible has so much to say about the destructive power of sin and of the perdition of ungodly men, that one thing at least must be admitted. There can be little of a man's former self saved out of the wreck of such destruction. And we still incline to believe that only a final extinction of the being of some sinners will satisfy these terms of Scripture. Although we also rejoice to believe that His

compassions and His wondrous ways of restoring grace exceed our highest thought.

The full truth about this deep mystery will not be known until we know the whole truth about the progress of life in creation. We know now that all this progress culminates in man, but that man in the flesh is not the final step in the series. His body is too frail and gross a vessel for such a priceless treasure as life eternal. Hence these vile bodies must be changed. The perfect image of God requires a reconstructed and glorified manhood. The whole drift and energy of this created system from the beginning has been towards the production of this noblest form of life. And it alone is eternal. All lower forms have contributed something toward this final result. The final form will gather up and perpetuate all that was worth preserving in these. But they themselves have passed, or must pass, away. The men of the human race are in training for this highest form of life. And God's school has more forms than one. The doctrine of the resurrection gives hope for the dead that their failure here is not necessarily final and remediless. But that all will succeed, that there will be no refuse even of human souls in this great workshop of God, is too much to affirm. There may be ways indeed unknown to us in which He may use this waste material, or work it over in new forms so that it may lose its character as waste. His judgments are a great deep. But that He is bound by His own character, or by His word, to endow every creature of the human race with personal immortality we are not required to believe either by the analogies of nature or the statements of His Word. Although we may be sure that those who are unworthy of this dignity,

and who must be cast away, are not doomed to an endless existence in hopeless torture. They may go down in the scale of creation until they become "like brute beasts made to be taken and destroyed." But if so, they must like them "*utterly perish*" (2 Peter ii. 12).

Our friend will thus understand that, if we were forced to choose between a doctrine of endless misery and of the final salvation of all we should certainly accept with him the latter. But perceiving, as we do, that the progress of life in creation toward the highest and enduring form of it has been always marked by the decay and death of lower and depraved forms, and that the Bible constantly speaks of this as the doom of all evil types of manhood, we are forced to believe that these *perish* from the way. The doctrine of the resurrection of the unjust does indeed cause one to hesitate, inasmuch as it shows that the lives of even this class of men are recovered for another trial, and under improved circumstances. But the case of "the angels who kept not their first estate," and of Adam, shows that even under the best circumstances the creature may choose evil. And Scripture seems to teach that there will be an incorrigible remnant whose end is destruction. Still we acknowledge that there is an unexplained mystery about such a result. Perhaps the solution of it will hereafter be found in the general law of life that while evil *types* of it must perish, and all of individual existence and of personality that is bound up in such a type must be lost with it, the life itself must continue to exist, gathering up into itself all that was good in its discarded forms, and finally reaching its perfect embodiment. The Christian carries his personality with him through the

crisis of death and resurrection. He saves *himself* and is not cast away (Luke ix, 25), while the *self* recovered by the sinful man at resurrection must be one maimed and stripped of its former heritage in proportion to its evil character. The resurrection of the unjust becomes thus truly a "resurrection of judgment" (John. v. 29)—of discrimination—by which only that about the former self which is worth preserving is restored. And the motive to good works in this life is re-enforced by the consideration that only in this way can men carry with them into the life to come that which will conserve their personal being and treasure up in perpetuity its endowments. Such a view would furnish a reconciling ground on which the two contrasted lines of Scripture teaching may be harmonized. All that it teaches concerning God's purpose to destroy the wicked may be made to harmonize with His loving purpose to seek and to save the lost. In a former book of ours, the "Mystery of Creation and of Man" we threw out some thoughts about the punishment of sin as being a "destruction *qua homo*," an ejection from the estate and prerogatives of life in manhood. But even after such a destruction there may be a salvation which, while the former personal self is lost, begins again with the outcast sprit away down the scale of creation, recovering it to such a sphere of life as it is capable of, and starting it again on an ascending plane. But confessedly this whole mystery is yet unsolved. All we are sure of is that our Lord God is merciful and gracious, that His tender mercies are over all His works; that He will by no means clear the guilty, and yet that neither death nor the destruction that must be visited upon the sinner, even though it

be age-long, can defeat His gracious purposes. That death is destructive and that resurrection is redemptive are both plain truths of His word. And that these two opposing lines of the divine administration blend in perfect harmony as they approach His high throne, and form a rainbow round it, we are sure. And whether these shall issue in the recovery of all, or whether the light from that throne shall so *burn up* all His enemies round about as to leave them neither root nor branch, we are sure that all generations shall hereafter join in the one song of praise before that throne when its judgments shall be made manifest.

THE SURVIVAL OF THE FITTEST.

Every one who is at all familiar with the science of today knows how much it makes of this Darwinian principle in explaining the progress of life. There is a doctrine of election in science as well as in Scripture. By a certain principle of selection the fittest are continually coming to the front and asserting their right of inheritance and of life. All improvement in the individual and in the species is along this line. Revelation has to deal with those aspirations implanted in man which impel him to the attainment of that ideal form of manhood which is the ultimate thought of God in creation. He means to see in man the perfect image of Himself realized—the acknowledged owner and administrator of His vast estate. And, therefore, the progress of man is toward this goal of a manhood

made perfect in eternal life. He must struggle out of this lower sphere of things temporal into that of things eternal. The fact that this requires a passage out of a region of things visible into that of things invisible makes no difference as to the reality of the transition. For even science recognizes that there is an invisible side of creation more truly real and permanent than is the side turned toward us, the phenomena of which are ever changing. The doctrine of the resurrection, as shown in our last number, is only the proper corollary of evolution. And the principle of the survival of the fittest finds its meaning and its justification in the fact that a portion of the human race are selected to survive the change of death and to emerge into that rank of glorious being which Scripture denominates "sons of God" (Rom. viii. 19–23). Such alone truly and properly *survive*. The crisis of death does not destroy—it only liberates—their true life. They have now eternal life and can never perish. They are the children of the resurrection.

Nothing is more plainly asserted of resurrection than the fact that it is eclectic and progressive. "Christ the first fruits, afterward they that are Christ's at His coming." And it is no less plainly declared of this class that they "never die." So that there must be a sense in which the *parousia* or coming of Christ is not to them an event of the distant future. Their resurrection is anticipated. Hence they are constantly spoken of in the New Testament as risen men, even while tabernacling here in the flesh (Col. i. 1; Ephes. ii. 6). Christ's word "I will come to you," (John. xiv. 18) is fulfilled to them even here.

But now we come upon a principle, undiscovered by science, and which it is the prerogative of Scripture to reveal, and which, while we do not know that it applies to the lower races of animals, does distinctly apply to man. It is the principle that the fittest are chosen to survive, not merely on their own account as the most worthy recipients of life, but that they may become channels of life and blessing to the less fit. The law of the survival of the fittest is an excellent thing for the fittest. But how about the less fit—the multitudes who are crowded back and trampled down in the struggle for existence. Science has been unable to discern that there is any benevolent design toward them in this law. She views them rather as the unhappy victims of it. Hence she is agnostic concerning God. Men see this law in tremendous operation, grinding down into mire and death the multitudes on whose prostrate forms the few rise to eminence and success. Hence pessimism like Schopenhauer's. But just here the Bible comes in to teach us that the fittest who survive are invested with a ministry of life and blessing toward the less fit. Even Calvinistic theology, with its proper insistance that election is taught in the Bible and required by any just view of the sovereignty of God, has not recognized this principle, that the elect become the chosen vessels of God's grace and bounty to their less favored brethren. The fittest are chosen to survive in order that they may raise up out of death and re-establish again in life the less fit. This principle puts an altogether different aspect upon the struggle of life in creation. It justifies and even glorifies what, without it, seems only a blind remorseless tendency. It furnishes the only relief and rescue to those

who seem compelled to adopt either the epicurean or the pessimistic view. Surely life is hardly worth living if only a chosen few are to reach its summit and wear its crown. But Christianity, in both its cultus and its doctrine, speaks with no uncertain voice about this matter. While all nature, and even its highest creature, man, seem to be supremely selfish, it teaches that unselfishness is the highest and the eternal law of life. Men who would save their lives must be altruistic. Instead of leaving the poor, the sick, and the bound to perish in their misery, the Lord of all men declares that the highest type of life can be attained only by those who tenderly minister to these unfortunates, and that only such go into life eternal (Matt. xxv. 46). However men may regard the refuse and the outcast classes, it was the mission of Christ to declare that such were still under the care of the common Father, and that the beggar Lazarus in his sores and rags should find at last an even treatment and full compensation. It was only by a loving self-sacrificing care of their poorer brethren who had been trodden down in the turmoil and rush of life, that men were to grow into the likeness and become partakers of the divine nature. So Jesus came to heal the sick, to set free the oppressed, to save the lost, and to give His life a ransom for many.

But it would be but a poor result, indeed, if all this training in self-sacrifice, this cultivation in the love that seeketh not her own, had no reference to a life beyond, and no scope there for its exercise. Can it be that the very thing that marks the eternal life this side the grave shall be absent beyond it? Must not that life there be essentially altruistic? Must it not prove that its springs

are in God, in that it shall shed forth blessing on all around, even upon the evil and the unthankful? And will there not be unthankful souls there to be won and evil souls to be rescued? That view of Christianity which bounds all its opportunities of seeking and saving the lost by death, denies its very essence. The saved here are such only as they become fitted to be saviours of others. Those who survive the crisis of death are the very ones who become fitted to go to the relief of their brethren who have been shipwrecked by it. Hence these fittest who survive are always spoken of as a first-born company. First-born imply later born. Under the Old Testament law the right and duty of redeeming their kinsmen was put upon the first-born. They were to raise up the name of the dead upon their lost inheritance. They were God's "kingdom of priests." And so God has still His elect and royal priesthood, chosen for that higher service and ministry of which the Mosaic law of the first-born was a shadow. These are "baptized for the dead." They first "attain unto the resurrection from the dead" (Phil. iii. 2). Jesus, the head of this anointed race, when He arose as the First-born from the dead, set free a multitude of captives with Him (Eph. iv. 8). It was a hope cherished among the early fathers that this work of liberation was still carried on by those saints who triumphed over death. And Scripture abounds in intimations that such is the fact. For what can the whole creation, in bondage to corruption, be awaiting the manifestation of the sons of God, if they are not the ordained instruments of its deliverance? And surely the multitudes of the human race—the highest and most intelligent part of this creation—who have gone

down to death under this yoke, are not excluded from the benefits of this deliverance. He who reads the Bible without perceiving that God's scheme of creation and redemption is charged with this deliverance to the captives, and this opening of the prison doors to them that are bound, fails to apprehend the meaning of Christ's triumph over death and of that great plan of creation by which the topmost branches on its tree of life are made to blossom and bud and to fill the face of the world with fruit. The law of the survival of the fittest is only God's way of preparing a chosen seed in which all the families of the earth are to be blessed. And that is a most narrow and unworthy view of this great purpose which makes death the limit of its beneficent provisions. Rather it is only through and after their triumph over death that this chosen seed become equipped for their work. And by far the larger proportion of those who need to be blessed by it have passed over into the realms of death and can only be reached there.

PRIMITIVE HOPE.—Into the fog and gloom of agnosticism there rings out like a bell these words of lofty hope from one to whom God had revealed things unseen.

"The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God; and if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with Him, that we may be also glorified together. For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us. For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the Sons of God. For the creature was made subject to vanity, not will-

ingly, but by reason of him who subjected it, in hope that the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation* groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now. And not only so, but ourselves also, which have the first fruits of the spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for our adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body. For we are saved by hope * * * And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, even to them who are called according to His purpose. For whom He did foreknow, them He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son, that He might be the first born among many brethren * * * What shall we say then to these things? If God be for us, who can be against us. He that spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not also with Him freely give us all things?"

EXTRACT. *In Paley's Moral and Political Philosophy,* Chapter VII., occurs this paragraph:

"It has been said that it can never be a just economy of Providence to admit one part of mankind into heaven and condemn the other to hell, since there must be very little to choose, between the worst man who is received into heaven and the best who is excluded. And how know we, it might be answered, but that there may be as little to choose in the conditions?"

The doctrine of a resurrection that is redemptive, and yet that does not confer—except upon the saints—eternal life, but only new conditions of trial under which it may be won, and these graded according to previous character, is just the one needed to meet the difficulty here suggested.

---

*Is not the unregenerate portion of the human race a part of the whole creation?

DR. WARFIELD'S REVIEW.

The July number of the *Presbyterian Review* contains a brief notice of *The Fire of God's Anger* from the pen of the Rev. B. B. Warfield, D. D., the new professor of theology at Princeton. As we trust we are more desirous to know and to teach the truth than to maintain our own consistency as the defender of any special view of it, we give our readers the benefit of Dr. Warfield's criticism in full. We are anxious to know, and we are willing that our readers should know, the most that can be said against any of our interpretations of Scripture.

The special object of this volume is to bring Scriptural evidence to the support of Mr. Baker's peculiar eschatological teaching; and more especially, by tracing the Bible doctrines of retribution and redemption first through the Old Testament and only thence into the New Testament, to secure that the deliverances of the latter shall be read by us in their true historical sense, and as they appear against their proper background of Old Testament teaching, of which they are the continuation and crown. As in all of Mr. Baker's writings, much that he says is happily conceived and very acceptable. In particular, the inductions at which he arrives from his study of Scripture, "That God's retributions for sin are fixed and inevitable, but that death, sin's wages, cannot snatch His creatures out of His hands, nor defeat His purposes" (p. 231), will readily be received by all Christian men. Equally true are the two great principles on which he rests his argument: that the death-state is essentially penal, the very penalty threatened by God for sin; and that resurrection, so far as a reversal of this penalty, is essentially a benefit, and results from Christ's work of redemption. But when he infers from these inductions and principles that the resurrection of the wicked is therefore a gracious restora-

tion of corruptible human life and manhood to them in order to afford them another opportunity to win salvation, he has flown out of sight of his premises, beyond the tether of reason, and flat in the face of Scripture. The result is that the adoption of his hypothesis forces on him, at every step, some new exegesis of the Scriptural passages that bear on the subject; and the present volume thus becomes a body of revised interpretations in the interests of the new theory. Revised interpretation for one point, however, usually ends by affecting others. Thus the upshot is inevitable that we shall also have a revised theology. "The whole doctrine of atonement and forgiveness of sins," we are told (p. 249), "needs to be re-examined." Already the pressure of Matt. x. 28 (p. 101) has given us a new anthropology. And the very roots of the theory are set in an insufficient view of sin, which believes that every claim of God's righteousness can be satisfied by a temporal punishment (p. 136, 250, 258). The professed object of this new eschatology is to save God's character (p. iv.); but it is hard to see any advantage it offers as an apologetic, when it teaches that the "renewed life" given to the reanimated wicked "is burdened with the evil heritage of the former life" (p. 168), and that each rises lower and lower down in the scale of manhood according as the blight of sin has withered and degraded his life here (pp. 144, 146); so that the secrets of all hearts here will be made manifest there "in the form, the grade, the potencies of the renewed manhood" (p. 167). If this renewed life, with its new opportunity, rests thus hard on the sin of this life, and may itself result in the "second death," from which there is no resurrection (pp. 147, 169, 201), or in endless existence on the outer circles of life, far removed from the presence of the Lord, in perpetual banishment and eternal experience of the suffering of loss and the shame of degradation (p. 132), but never in the dignity and glory of the Church of the first-born (pp. 131, 241), we are at a loss to see either (1) how it can be said that this reanimation does not reach the wicked until their death sentence has been exhausted (p. 258) and judgment for their sins has been satisfied (p. 250), along with "every claim of God's right-

easiness" (p. 18); or (2) what theodicy can arise from this view which is not equally valid for the eschatology of our creeds.

To this review we have to say in reply:

1. That nothing is easier than for a practised polemic to pick out flaws and to frame objections against any treatise which, with our present light, the best instructed writer may prepare upon such a subject as future punishment. Let Dr. Warfield write a defense of the Westminster doctrine on that subject, which he has just sworn to uphold, and let him seek to harmonize all the Scripture passages bearing upon it with the statements that immediately after death the souls of the unrighteous are cast into the most grievous torments of hell, there to be reserved until a general resurrection and the final judgment, the issue of which is already determined, and that immediately thereupon these damned souls, reunited to their bodies, shall be thrust back into hell that so in their completed personality they may be punished "with unspeakable torments in soul and body, without intermission, with the devil and his angels in hell-fire forever;" and we hazard nothing in saying that the difficulties which will beset his way will be mountainous as compared with those he points out in our case.

2. Our book was written mainly to establish the truth of the principle that there is a redemptive character to resurrection, and therefore to show that the eschatology of the Reformed Churches, specially of the Presbyterian church, must needs be reconstructed around this principle. For the quotation just made from the Confession of Faith shows how utterly this principle is ignored. We do not claim in the book that all its attempts to adjust this principle to the other truths of Scripture are entirely successful (pg. 171). We were only anxious that the principle itself should be recognized and adopted as a new and controlling factor in the solution of this great mystery. Failure to testify to this principle perverts and obscures the gospel and puts a mask over the face of our Father God. And therefore our contention has been for the very vitals of the Christian faith. We were satisfied that with this principle once

fairly admitted, a revision of the orthodox teaching upon this dread subject must soon follow.

3. We ask our readers to notice that Dr. Warfield here admits the truth of this principle. This quite compensates for the hard things he has to say against us. His language is, "Equally true are the two great principles on which he rests his argument: that the death-state is essentially penal, the very penalty threatened by God for sin; and that resurrection, as so far a reversal of this penalty, is essentially a benefit and results from Christ's work of redemption." That is just what we are contending for. Resurrection, as a fruit of Christ's redeeming work, is a reversal of sin's penalty and *essentially a benefit.* We ask Dr. Warfield then, where the benefit comes in in the Westminister view of the resurrection of the unjust? Where is the remotest suggestion of a benefit in the doubling up and endless sealing of the sinner's damnation which it teaches? How can Dr. Warfield possibly make this admission consistent with his recent solemn pledge to maintain and defend these statements?

He does indeed go on to say, "But when he infers from these inductions and principles that the resurrection of the wicked is therefore a gracious restoration of corruptible human life and manhood to them in order to afford them another opportunity to win salvation, he has flown out of sight of his premises, beyond the tether of reason, and flat in the face of Scripture." He then goes on to complain that the whole of our book is a body of revised interpretations of Scripture, and that if the novelty be allowed at this point, the whole current system of theology must needs be revised. Now to this we have to say that it is unfair to represent us as teaching that the unjust dead are raised "in order to afford them a second opportunity to win salvation," when we hold that a majority of the human race never had a *first* opportunity. There is a confusion in many minds between the terms "salvation" and "eternal life." All men come into the world under the guilt of the race-sin, and go down to death and hell—unless made the sons of God by faith in Jesus Christ (John i. 12)—under condemnation. From this

pit of death, however, all men are saved in the fact that for all there has been provided a resurrection from the dead (Rom. v. 12-21; 1 Cor. xv. 22; 1 Tim. ii. 6). But this does not secure to all eternal life and sonship to God. It is only through the knowledge of God in Christ that this high boon is conferred (John xvii. 2, 3). Now we believe that the purpose of God in recovering to life the human race is that all may come to this "knowledge of the truth" (1 Tim. ii. 3-6), and so have the opportunity of eternal life. This, for all who never heard of Christ is not "another opportunity." It is their only opportunity.

But if this be not the precise benefit brought in by their resurrection, will Dr. Warfield state what the benefit is? He admits that this recovery brings with it "essential benefit." Our explanation of this blessing he declares to be away off from our premises and a flat contradiction of Scripture. But if Dr. Warfield contends that this benefit is even a mitigation of the sufferings of the lost he flies flat in the face of his Standards. For they make it to be an untold aggravation of their misery. Unless the recovery from the death-state—which our critic admits to be sin's penalty—brings back with it the opportunities which inhere in restored life, we cannot see where the "essential benefit" comes in. But waiving the question of the logic of our inference, what hurts us most is to be told that it "flies flat in the face of Scripture." Why then does not Dr. Warfield prove this? Here again we are doomed to disappointment. Not one of the critics of our book has attempted a refutation of its argument from Scripture. We have been met time and again, as here, with assertion. And single passages have been quoted which seem to bear against us. But, as Dr. Warfield justly observes, our argument is virtually a revised interpretation of Scripture. It rests not merely upon single passages but upon the light which the great principle of redemptive resurrection throws upon the whole volume, and upon the plan of the world which it reveals. For example, when the Bible starts out with a thrice repeated promise that in a chosen seed all the families of the earth shall be blessed, we

say that when it says "all" it means all, and that, in order to make the promise good, God pledges Himself by the mouth of holy prophets to show wonders to the dead—who are the major part of the all—as well as to the living. Dr. Warfield would limit the "all" either to an elect class, as does his Confession, or make the promise apply to some distant millenial period when all nations shall be blessed with the light of the gospel. We submit, Which of these interpretations flies most in the face of Scripture? It is not necessary, however, that we go over again in this reply the Scripture ground so often trodden in these pages. If our reviewer had given either principles or passages of Scripture to sustain his bold assertion, we would cheerfully meet him on this ground. As he has not given them we can simply meet assertion with assertion. We affirm that the main point of our contention—that the resurrection of even the unjust is a gracious intervention and in fulfilment of God's promise to bless all generations through a chosen seed—is proved, and Dr. Warfield cordially admits it. As to whether his inferences from that principle are more correct than ours which he stigmatizes, we leave our readers to decide.

4. As to his allegation that our revised system of interpretation must issue in a new anthropology, in a modified doctrine of atonement, and in a general revision of theology, we accept the charge. It is high time for such a revision. When a fundamental principle of the Gospel has been left out in the construction of the current system, is it any wonder that its whole conception of man, of his relation to God, of his redemption and his destiny, must needs be restated? On the page before Dr. Warfield's review of our book occurs his review of Dr. McCosh's recently published lectures on the *Religious Aspect of Evolution.* While he does not go to the full length with Dr. McCosh in accepting the fact of evolution as "completely made out," "demonstrated," he yet has evident sympathy with it, and commends the book as a highly useful apologetic. Does any one doubt that when the evolutionary hypothesis comes to be fully accepted among theologians as true science, even to the extent to which it is accepted by Dr. McCosh, that a large part of

Princeton theology will have to be re-written? Will the old doctrine of the creation of man, of the fall, of man's inherent immortality, of the methods of his redemption, and of his final destiny, long stand before it? We are not now asking whether the truth that is essential to these doctrines will be given up. We have no fear of that. But many of the accessories with which these truths have been loaded in the way of human explanations will have to go. Let Dr. Warfield possess his soul in patience over the dangers to his system from the principle of redemptive resurrection. The revision will have to come from another quarter if it does not come from this. The seeds of it are already sown in Princeton, and too thickly to be eradicated. We hope and pray that God will give him the wisdom and grace to prepare for it. After listening to Dr. Patton's inaugural, we do not see how Princeton's new President can hesitate to follow in the path of progress opened by his predecessor. We hope much from him. Who knows but that these two young men—the one in the seat of learning, the other in that of theology—both of whom are men more open to the light than the Princeton creed admits of, may have come to the kingdom for such a time as this.

With regard to the minor points made by Dr. Warfield they are comparatively unimportant provided the main principle be conceded. When he assumes that the claims of God's righteousness for *temporal* sin must needs be satisfied by an *endless* punishment he speaks without warrant of reason. And as to warrant of Scripture, that is the very point in dispute. And the justice of our view of it he virtually concedes when he consents to regard resurrection as a "reversal of penalty." A stronger point is the one he raises against our view of "the resurrection of judgment," as bringing over into the restored manhood an evil heritage from the past after penalty is remitted. But this seems to be a necessary consequence in any scheme of moral government. A captive set free from a penal colony, a convict liberated from prison, is thereby set free from all legal penalty and restored to full rights of citizenship. But this does not permit of his beginning life again as though he had never been a

criminal. He has suffered in person, in health, in fortune, and in character, and is loaded for his new struggle of life with these disadvantages from the past. We have believed that the laws of life, which are the law of God, would thus assert themselves in the new embodiment. While admitting that there must be a corrective value in hadean sufferings preparatory to resurrection, yet nothing is more profoundly true that every one must receive *in body* according to the deeds done (2d Cor. v. 10 Gr.), and that every defective form of being must keep its possessor under trial and judgment, and liable to a second death. However, as we stated at the outset, these adjustments of this principle of redemptive resurrection are of small importance compared with the principle itself. Only we confess surprise when Dr. Warfield cannot discover in even the harshest view of retribution possible under these two principles of a resurrection that sets free, and yet is according to character, a theodicy infinitely better than that furnished by the eschatology of his creed. No reasonable view of the divine fatherhood is possible under his system. And he ought to know it.

CHURCH UNITY.

The Rev. S. J. Andrews, a minister of the Catholic Apostolic Church, has sent us a copy of a recent monograph of his upon Church Unity, put in the form of a letter to the Rt. Rev. John Williams, D.D., Bishop of Connecticut. It contains many important and suggestive thoughts. With respect to his theory that unity can never be restored until there be a restoration of the full ministries of the apostolic church, that is prophets and apostles, we can only say here that it doubtless has an element of truth in it. We purpose to make some

observations upon it in a future number. We must content ourselves now with some extracts toward the close in which some things important to this whole subject are said.

In all the current discussions, most speak of the existing divisions as misfortunes for which nobody in particular is responsible, rather than as sins offensive to God for which He will punish all. I do not doubt the Spirit of God is in the movement, and that it will broaden and deepen, but now it is little more than an exchange of courtesies and good wishes.

A few earnest men here and there are seeking some remedy, and proposing some slight compromises, and partial co-operations. But there are two great obstacles to anything like true unity, first, that each division affirms that it has more of truth, more of right order, more that is according to God's mind, than any other; and that the rest, therefore, must come to it. But what is peculiar to it and most highly valued by it, the other divisions will not accept. No one in your communion will give up the Episcopate for the sake of unity; the Presbyterian will not give up the parity of presbyters and bishops, or the Congregationalist the independence of the local church, or the Baptist the rejection of infant baptism; and so with all. There will be in every part some who become indifferent to its leading peculiarities, but time only intensifies sectarianism in the rest, because bringing out more clearly the distinctive principles of each. There may be expressions of friendly feeling, but practically each part remains where it is.

The second obstacle is that very few in any part look beyond their own personal salvation. This, it is said, can be secured in any of the evangelical bodies; why then change? Many roads lead to heaven; why go from one to another? That God has a purpose in human salvation which can be carried out only by the whole Church acting as one, is a matter of comparative indifference because not understood, or perhaps, not believed.

To these obstacles may be added the prejudices of education, the force of habit, the zeal of conquest, the fear of reproach,

the dislike of novelties, and all those considerations which tend to make us walk in the old and familiar paths.

There is much to indicate that before any true union can be effected, the process of church disintegration, which so many now welcome as progress, must go on further, and corporate unity more and more disappear. The Scriptures seem often to intimate this. If the Spirit be grieved, the bonds of spiritual cohesion become weak, the baptized fall apart, each man looks at his own and not at the things of others. Upon the sands of individualism no stable structure, political or religious, can be built. Out of the sea—society which has lost its solidity, and is dissolved into its personal units, and become a mass of restless, heaving waters—does the beast come up. (Rev. xiii. 1.) The Lord in His Epistle to Laodicea turns from its angel, the corporate head, and addresses Himself to its individual members: "If any man hear my voice," pointing to the want of church authority and unity (Rev. iii, 20).

With all respect for the sincerity and ability of those engaged in these attempts at union, I cannot expect from them any lasting results. Something will be gained if there is a theoretical recognition of the truth that only those "who walk in the Spirit" can "keep the unity of the Spirit;" and that organization, not disorganization, is the law of Christ's body.

I believe it would be a gain if all the non-episcopal bodies would recognize the true place and ministry of bishops, but such a recognition, to be of any real value, must rest on the faith that this ministry is of Divine appointment, and must permit it to do its proper work. I confess that I do not see any signs of this. So far from accepting a new ministry, most of these bodies are more inclined to make little account of those they have, and in general would regard a lay evangelist like Moody as better than ten bishops.

It is a fact we may not overlook that the great battle between truth and falsehood, righteousness and unrighteousness, good and evil, God and Satan, is to be fought out in the bosom of the Church itself. As is the light so is the darkness, as the Spirit of truth, so the spirit of error; and therefore, first of all, must the

prince of this world be overcome in the circle of Christ's disciples, His chosen ones. Here is the place of the trial, and of the conflict, and of the victory. Here are the depths of Satan and the depths of God to be revealed. I cannot but think it a delusion that so many should turn away their attention from the Church itself, and fasten it upon the struggle between Christianity and heathenism, as if the spiritual condition of His children and their relation to one another, were a matter of indifference to God, provided only that they are zealous to to make converts from the heathen. The first and indispensable duty of the Church is to keep itself in the love of God, and it cannot do this unless it keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. It can wage no successful warfare without when torn in pieces by internal dissensions. If our present divisions are offensive to God, how much more must He be offended at their reproduction among our proselytes. No zeal for missions can be a substitute for brotherly love. It is little gain to march out with banners displayed to conquer the heathen, if the infidel creeps in and takes possession of our holy city. The Lord at the beginning of His ministry cleansed His Father's temple from its disorder and defilements, and so again at the end; perhaps a prophetic sign!

EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS.

From a Presbyterian elder in central New York:—

Although a stranger I trust you will pardon my familiarity in addressing you, for I feel a deep sympathy for you and in the work of reform in our Standards. Your books have afforded me the greatest satisfaction, and cannot but commend themselves to every candid mind, and if I rightly judge they will prove to be an important factor in the bringing about the desired result and advancing the glorious kingdom of our Lord and Master. I am sorry you had to sacrifice your standing in our Church in order that truth might abound, but who shall prevail against the Lord? Moreover, I rejoice that some are found who do not count the cost too dear to stand loyal to the

truth. We remember "the greater the cross, the greater the crown" and put our trust in the Lord.

I shall endeavor to keep your books in circulation among my acquaintances, for I am confident of the comfort they have afforded me and desire my friends to share with me this joy. For a number of years I had been looking for light in this very direction, and to discover if possible the cause of so much unbelief. Who shall say that the fault does not lie at our very doors in our doctrine of the eternal damnation of the lost in hellfire forever? Previous to reading Drummond's work and your books I had endeavored to put my own ideas of life and death on paper, and so I was agreeably surprised that there was so much of harmony between them.

From a lady subscriber :—

I do not know enough to judge of the correctness of your exegesis, but I do know that the spirit of all your words is inspiring, suggestive and helpful, and yet more so is the example of your courageous action. It is one of the most cheering things that I know of in the Presbyterian Church. That is the Church in which I was brought up, though I am now in the church home of my own affections and convictions, and am an Episcopalian. I have none the less, however, of sincere sympathy and earnest interest in your movement. It cannot fail to do good.

Many of our readers will remember the case of the Rev. John W. White, of Milroy, Pa., who separated from the Presbytery of Huntingdon, a few years ago after being arraigned before that body for heresy. They will be doubtless interested in reading the following letter from him :—

My Dear Brother. I congratulate you on your stand for freedom and your release from bondage to the traditions of men. I have a fellow feeling for you, having myself passed through a similar experience a few years ago. We may err in our judgments and interpretations of the Word of God, but surely, not more grievously than our fathers did. What blind folly it is to try to bind men, in this free age, when the morning light is breaking, to hold and teach the traditions of the dark ages. From the little I have seen in the papers with regard to your views, I think it is very likely that we differ somewhat in our eschatology. And why not? One is our Master, even Christ. Our final account must be given to him and we must be left free to

serve him according to the light he gives us. "All ye are brethren." We may confess, may entreat, may instruct if we can, and may witness to the grace of God, in a fraternal way; but we may lord it over others, never. The Church of Christ is founded upon this rock: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God." No other acknowledgement or confession of faith was demanded by the apostles for church membership or the work of the ministry (see 1st John iv. 1-3). What right have men now to demand more, to require others not only to receive Christ as Lord and Master; but to profess faith in the five points of Calvinism, in baptism by immersion, in Luther's doctrine of justification, in the orthodox doctrine of atonement or of hell, etc. While the spirit of Rome pervades the ministry, it must continue to divide the Church in the future, as it has done in the past, into hundreds of rival, jealous, warring sects, and justify the statement of Froude that "there is a great difference between the Christian religion and the religion of Christ." When will men learn that the truth does not need the testimony of men, that it is self-evincing to those who love it and seek it for its own sake, that it cannot be enforced by dogmatism or the infliction of penalties; and that the more men are left free to seek, to find and to follow the one Master, the sooner they will become one in him. The world would laugh to scorn any attempt to enforce by law, as the decree of some assembly, the truths of science. It will not much longer bear with force in maintaining religious beliefs. There is only one thing that saves it now from the opprobium it deserves, that is, the general belief that men have a right to organize a church, if they please, to propagate a particular belief and to say to others, if you do not believe as we do you are free to depart. Men have a right to form such a society; but, I deny their right to call such a society the church or to make within the church any such regulations—Christ alone is Master in his household. Again congratulating you, and praying that the Master may ever lead and bless you, I remain,

Yours fraternally,

JNO. W. WHITE.

A correspondent writes to us from California.

I have been very much interested in the report in the *N. Y., Evangelist* of May 3d, of the action of the Presbytery of West Jersey in your case. A long time ago I came to the full conviction that the doctrine of endless punishment as taught by our orthodox churches was an error. Instead of this change of belief leading me farther away from God and into the license

and excesses of the carnal mind, as some claim must be the consequence of this negative belief, I have been drawn closer to Him in love and gratitude and confidence. I trust I have as great fear of offending Him, of grieving the Holy Spirit and lapsing into sinful enjoyments, and of a failure to grow in grace as at any time in my Christian life.

But the question which you seem to have solved of the doom of the finally impenitent was one that I had not yet found an answer to, although inclining to annihilation as the sinner's probable fate. It had not occurred to me that this might not be until after a suitable future probation. Your theory that the resurrection may afford opportunity for renewed trial although "in accordance with the harvest law that prevails in all God's realms of life—To every seed his own body" seems to be so entirely reasonable that I want to know more of your views and teachings which I suppose are embodied in your magazine. In order to this will you be kind enough to send me a copy with price so that I may become a subscriber.

We have been sometimes told that our view of future punishment tends to make people careless. We know of one case at least in which a reader has been awakened to new interest in the solemnity of the subject. Concerning this case a ministerial friend writes:

"I was greatly interested to know from one of your subscribers that the views of punishment, etc., presented in WORDS OF RECONCILIATION had been the means of kindling a *more* serious and even anxious attention to these subjects than she had before realized. The truth is that the old representations had proved so repulsive and dreadful as simply to work their own rejection.

"I enjoyed your resumé of the General Assembly, and sympathize with your view of what it leaves undone that ought to be done. One might almost conclude that God did not purpose to give the seekers after truth any leading at all through the agency of the General Assembly. And that body seems most indifferent to anything like growth in the apprehension of truth. Its ambition, like that of Princeton Seminary in theological matters, seems to extend beyond nothing more than (as Professor Patton calls it) 'keeping faith with the dead.' I almost wish that one could now and then come back to us from the dead to show us what is their *present* faith, and how much better worth the keeping it is than that which we are so careful to observe with all its imperfections."

From a Presbyterian Minister:—

I do not think that you have needed any formal assurance to make you aware of my sympathy in your trials. You have my prayers for the all-sufficient grace of God to be with you. I do hope that you will not be compelled to suppress your testimony and your work for the promotion of greater freedom of investigation in the searching after the truth of God as contained in His word. I do not think your work is yet done, and I trust the Lord will enable you to carry it on effectively. I am glad that you emphasize what so many seem disposed to shut their eyes to—that your reasonings are only an endeavor to show *what the Lord reveals in His word*, and that no attempt has been made by your adversaries to *refute* your *scriptural* arguments.

I could not but notice in the article of the *Herald and Presbyter*, which you attribute to Dr. DeWitt, the two things in the first paragraph which do not seem to match—"no one who has read his magazine will deny that he has presented his opinions *with clearness*," and then, "*if we understand him*."

Your mention of the overture of the Presbytery of Nassau is the only one that I have seen of it. I saw no notice of it in the Assembly proceedings, though, of course, its only fate could be squelching. But it is a significant evidence that there is motion in the Church, at least, that such an overture could have passed even in a small Presbytery. It is an indication that if Brother Baker had been a member of *that* Presbytery, he would not have been invited out. And the Presbytery of West Jersey, in its majority decision, is not the Presbyterian Church, as a whole, though probably any Assemby that might be gathered would render a similar decision on such a question. But we may rest in the confidence of the final triumph of the truth, and that is what you desire, I know, whether it be with the establishing or overturning of your own views.